

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of	)	
Masanori Kato et al.	)	Group Art Unit: 2835
Application No.: 10/583,407	)	Examiner: Gregory D. Thompson
Filed: June 20, 2006	)	Confirmation No.: 3576
For: OUTDOOR APPARATUS	)	

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Confirming the telephone message left with Examiner Thompson, the Restriction Requirement issued March 21, 2008 is incomplete. Applicants respectfully request that a new, complete, Office Action be issued before they are required to substantively respond to the Restriction Requirement.

Section 1. of the Office Action sets forth three inventions identified by the Examiner, among which restriction was required. This section is immediately followed by Section 2., which begins with the statement "Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct *for the reasons given above....*" However, there are no such reasons appearing in the Office Action. Specifically, the Office Action does not provide any reasons why the identified inventions are considered to be independent or distinct.